

understands that the nature of modern warfare has changed—it is murkier, dirtier, and involves a variety of state- and non-state actors.

But that fact should not compel Congress to forfeit its constitutional responsibility to directly authorize the use of force. It should not preclude any administration from receiving direct authorization from the Congress to engage in global conflicts.

Earlier this year, the House Foreign Affairs Committee had a productive hearing where each of the three expert witnesses testified that this AUMF is not necessary. It does not enhance our national security. It does not make Americans any safer. It does not make the mission of our men and women in uniform any easier. To repeal this resolution would not tie the hands of the current administration or any future administration in their responsibility to preserve the national security of the United States—it would instead ensure that it could not be manipulated to take us into a war that Congress did not authorize.

If we fail to act, we run the risk of opportunistic legal interpretations leading to a slippery slope until our country finds itself on a permanent war footing. Congress did not authorize that in 2002. We shouldn't tacitly authorize it by failing to act. Let's do our jobs—we owe it to the American people and to our men and women in uniform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3261.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

#### REPEAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3283) to repeal the joint resolution entitled, "A joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3283

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REPEAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

Effective on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East" (Public Law 85-7; 22 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3283, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3283 to repeal the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East," offered by Representative MEIJER.

Earlier, I made the case for continuing this Chamber's hard work of reclaiming congressional war powers, started less than 2 weeks ago by our vote to repeal the 2002 AUMF and continued by our debate today to repeal the 1991 AUMF and the 1957 AUMF.

□ 1545

I will keep my remarks short so as not to belabor the points I made earlier, as the case for repealing the 1941 AUMF similarly applies to the 1957 AUMF, if not more so.

Going way back, I was barely a toddler when this authorization was passed, and I have been here for a while. The fact that this authorization still exists as good law today indicates the vital need for Congress to take seriously its responsibility over war and peace and repeal AUMFs once their purpose has been served or expired.

Good legislative housekeeping requires us not to just authorize force when needed to protect and defend this Nation, but to recall and repeal authorities when their usefulness has passed.

The Soviet Union this authorization was meant to counter no longer exists. There is no Soviet Union now. The 1957 AUMF is a relic of the Cold War. It is outdated and obsolete.

We, as Members of Congress, have been granted the responsibility to make decisions on matters of war and peace by the Constitution, a responsibility none of us takes lightly. However, for far too long we have failed to make those decisions at all. Instead, we have ceded our Article I authority to administrations that have reinterpreted old AUMFs. The threat of that abuse continues so long as we allow these authorizations to remain in the U.S. Code.

I thank again the ranking member for working with us to bring this bill forward. I thank Representative MEIJER for authoring this legislation. And I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I thank the chairman for, again, exercising our Article I constitutional responsibilities. That is what leadership is all about, and this one is very bipartisan, and again, I think historic. Because in my memory we have never done this before successfully.

I also thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER) for introducing this bill to repeal an aging AUMF that has never been used in the 64 years since it was enacted.

Now, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't even born when this AUMF was enacted. Just barely, though. I was born not long after that. But that is amazing as I stand here at almost 60 years old. That law gave the President authority to "use Armed Forces to assist any Middle East nation requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism."

This unused relic of the Cold War should not be left on the books or on the shelf for a creative President to dust off and put to unexpected use. So I think we all agree, if a President was to commit U.S. troops to new hostilities in the Middle East, he or she should come to the Congress for authorization.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason I support this repeal, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a very valued member of our committee on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of repealing the 1957 AUMF. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member, I was also not born when this Authorization for Use of Military Force was put in place.

In addition to considering my legislation to repeal the 1991 Gulf war AUMF, I am pleased that we are considering a separate bill that I co-lead with Congressman MEIJER to repeal an open-ended resolution from 1957 that authorized the use for military force in the Middle East.

This Cold War-era authorization still on the books today is more than 60 years old, and it provides outdated, blank-check authorities to an executive branch or Presidential administration that might seek to justify expanded operations in the Middle East. It is not necessary, and we must repeal it.

Repealing this resolution would not undermine any existing U.S. military operations, but it would help ensure that its significantly outdated authorities are not used or abused by any future President. Additionally, it would show that Congress is ready to exercise its responsibilities under the Constitution.

I was pleased to see this bill pass out of the Foreign Affairs Committee on a voice vote, and I appreciate Congressman MEIJER's leadership, as well as the bipartisan cosponsors who have joined him.

It is far past time for Congress to reassert our war powers. I welcome the bipartisan and diverse coalitions that have mobilized around this shared goal of constitutional responsibility, Congress demonstrating its sense of responsibility as it relates to authorizing war powers in moving forward with repealing these outdated and unused authorizations.

We owe it to our constituents, especially those who have served in uniform. While they time and time again demonstrate their willingness to serve our Nation, there should never be a worry that they may be deployed under a 60-year-old-plus authority. It is important that every time we send servicemembers off to war, we here in the United States Congress are taking the step of being responsible by voting on authorizations.

Today, it is time to vote to take this outdated resolution off the books. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to do so today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the House Rules Committee, a man who has dedicated quite a bit of time to this issue, and I would say is one of the leaders in the House on Authorizations for Use of Military Force and the War Powers Act and reasserting Congress' role.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding, and I want to be the first to admit I was alive when both of these authorizations were passed.

The Congress' current effort to review the existing authorities for military force for which the original purposes have been achieved or are no longer appropriate is an important exercise of this body's authority under the Constitution and pursuant to the War Powers Act.

I am pleased to note that Chairman MCGOVERN and I, along with my friends, Chairman MEEKS and Ranking Member MCCAUL, helped initiate an evaluation of the War Powers Act, its strength and limitations and its need for modernization in a hearing on this topic in March. It is fitting, and frankly overdue, that the House is considering these issues and is now poised to repeal a second and third outdated AUMF this year with strong bipartisan support.

The joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East was enacted in 1957, 2 years after the signing of the Warsaw Pact, in response to the concerns about the potential spread of communist influence in the Middle East and, therefore, threats to U.S. economic and political interests in the region is long overdue. Needless to say, much has changed in the 64 intervening years. The Berlin Wall has fallen, and six of the seven former Eastern Bloc countries are now allied with the United States through NATO. The Soviet Union, of course, is no more. Communism obviously re-

mains in the world, but it is no longer the driving force for most threats to the United States, particularly in the Middle East.

Similarly, the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 is not related to the current situation in Iraq, and therefore, defunct. United Nations Resolution 678 authorized member states to use force to restore peace and order in response to Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. President Bush stated on multiple occasions at the time, including in his signing statement of this AUMF, that he believed he had sufficient constitutional authority to use force in this case. However, he did not test the question, and requested and welcomed the AUMF. With or without the United Nations approval, in spite of the action's intent to enforce international law and, regardless of my support for the action taken by President Bush at that time, it was the initiation of a war, and in my opinion, the President was obligated to seek Congressional approval. However, since the issue has been long-since settled, it is time to revoke the outdated authority.

Let us reinforce with this action today, Mr. Speaker, that should the President find reason to initiate military action subject to the War Powers Act in Iraq or anywhere in the Middle East, he or she must come to Congress with information, justification, and request for approval.

Also going forward, I strongly suggest this and future Congresses consistently establish a sunset of future authorizations either by a firm expiration date in the authorization or triggered by satisfaction of clear and specific objectives.

Once again, I support the passage of H.R. 3283 and H.R. 3261.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER), the author of this repeal.

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill today to repeal the outdated and unnecessary 1957 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

We have heard from many on just how this bill originally designed to defend Middle East nations against "armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism," how far it has outstripped its usefulness, no longer serving any purpose, but still retains that potential to be abused by any current or future administration to launch unwarranted military operations in the Middle East and doing an end run around Congress.

The repeal we are discussing today would have no impact on ongoing operations, and is all the more reason to take it off the books immediately, but, Mr. Speaker, a decades-long war on terror and the lack of oversight, the lack of that reaffirming action on behalf of Congress has demonstrated to us the risks when we neglect our constitu-

tional duty to oversee matters of war and peace. It is time that Congress get back in the habit of vigorously debating and voting on these matters because the Constitution and the American people demand it.

I applaud the work of my colleagues to help lead this bipartisan effort to restore Congress' authority. Congresswoman SPANBERGER's bill to repeal the outdated 1991 AUMF is another critical step in this effort, and I am proud to support her on this matter.

I also thank Congressman MIKE GALLAGHER and Congressman JARED GOLDEN for helping to lead the effort to repeal the 1957 and 1991 AUMFs. And lastly, I thank Chairman MEEKS and Ranking Member MCCAUL for helping to bring these bills to the House floor for a vote and for their leadership on reprising Congress' authority in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage on this bill.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, while the chairman was a toddler when this was enacted, I still was not born. I want to make that point. That is how old this thing is. And it is time. It is great to exercise our constitutional responsibilities and repeal these outdated AUMFs so that they can never be manipulated or exploited by a future President.

Again, I view this as a historic moment that Congress and this committee are exercising its powers as the Founding Fathers had wanted us to.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the author of this, Mr. MEIJER, I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank Mr. MEIJER for this piece of legislation. Again, I thank Mr. MCCAUL for working together, and I have no come back; yes, I was just a toddler, you weren't here yet.

There seems to be a theme, and if you think there is a theme that is going on today, there is a theme. The theme is that we in the United States Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, are acting to reclaim our Congressional war powers. First, we voted to repeal the 2002 AUMF, then the 1991 AUMF, and now the 1957 AUMF. These authorizations serve no current national security purpose and only risk to strip Congress of its Article I authority to decide matters of war and peace. That is the theme here today.

The work is not over. We still have to work, as I have said, and I pledge to work with Mr. MCCAUL to repeal and replace the 2001 AUMF. But it is our solemn responsibility to decide when, where, and how we deploy members of our armed services and not take a back seat on such decisions to the executive branch.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, working together, we will indeed do what Article I tells us to do: To determine when, where, and how we go to war.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3283, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

### CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF TREVOR REED

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 186) calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to nine years in a Russian prison.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 186

Whereas United States citizen Trevor Reed is a resident of Granbury, Texas, and a United States Marine Corps veteran;

Whereas Trevor Reed traveled to Moscow to visit his girlfriend in May 2019;

Whereas Moscow's Police Service detained Trevor Reed in August 2019;

Whereas Trevor Reed was accused of grabbing the arm of the police officer driving the vehicle and elbowing another officer while en route to the police station, causing the vehicle to swerve and therefore endangering the lives of the police officers;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Moscow has filed numerous diplomatic notes with the Russian Foreign Ministry regarding Trevor Reed being denied consular access, communications, medical treatment, family visitations, and other violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations;

Whereas Trevor Reed was not given food or water until approximately 72 hours after his initial arrest;

Whereas Trevor Reed was not given a medical evaluation of his injuries until 10 days following his arrest;

Whereas Trevor Reed's defense team presented video evidence to the courts that disproves the police officers' statements of supposed endangerment and wrongdoing;

Whereas Trevor Reed's defense team was denied access to additional video evidence from inside the police vehicle and police station that had the potential to prove his innocence, the requests for all video recordings are documented, and the existence of the other videos was confirmed by police officials and investigators;

Whereas the police officers claimed emotional and physical damages, but did not sustain any visible injury, or claim any time missed from work, and the law considers the police officers victims;

Whereas the Constitutional Supreme Court of the Russian Federation and the Second Court of Cassation of General Jurisdiction concurred that Russian procedural law was violated in the way that Trevor Reed's bail was revoked;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Moscow has filed complaints with the Russian Foreign Ministry regarding denial of communications with Trevor Reed;

Whereas during the trial, the defense counsel presented 59 minutes of traffic camera video from four traffic cameras, and senior Russian Government officials analyzed the video recordings and confirmed that the videos showed the police car—

(1) did not change direction or leave its lane;

(2) did not swerve; and

(3) did not stop or slow down;

Whereas witnesses following directly behind the police car in a private vehicle never witnessed any dangerous movement of the police car;

Whereas the two police officers changed their testimonies in writing, in their interviews, and at least three times during defense questioning, with final answers to the judge being "I don't remember," causing court attendees and the judge to laugh;

Whereas the Investigative Bureau and Golovinsky District Court Judge Arnout denied Trevor Reed's requests to investigate how his injuries occurred;

Whereas, on July 30, 2020, Golovinsky District Court Judge Arnout read a verdict that dismissed all defense evidence, witnesses, and government experts and only considered pieces of the police officers' statements;

Whereas the judge sentenced Trevor Reed to 9 years in prison camp and was ordered to pay 100,000 rubles to each police officer for moral and physical injuries;

Whereas Trevor Reed had already been detained in Russia for one year at the time of the judge's verdict;

Whereas a Consul representing the United States Embassy in Moscow attended all of Trevor Reed's trial hearings;

Whereas the United States Ambassador to Russia, John Sullivan, upon Trevor's sentencing, stated that the prosecution's case and the evidence presented against Mr. Reed were "so preposterous that they provoked laughter in the courtroom", the conviction and sentence were "ridiculous", and "justice was not even considered";

Whereas, upon appeal to the Moscow City Court, the Golovinsky District Court failed to provide Trevor Reed with translated copies of the court's decision and trial transcripts per law; and

Whereas the appeal court returned the case to the Golovinsky District Court to review omissions and incorrect statements in the trial transcripts, and the official court audio recordings were reviewed by the defense and the corrections were certified by a third-party notarization firm, with the result being Judge Arnout refusing to include any corrections to the corrupted transcripts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately release Trevor Reed and all other prisoners arrested for political motivations;

(2) condemns the practice of politically motivated imprisonment in the Russian Federation, which violates the commitments of the Russian Federation to international obli-

gations with respect to human rights and the rule of law;

(3) urges the United States Government, in all its interactions with the Government of the Russian Federation, to raise the case of Trevor Reed and to press for his release;

(4) expresses support for Trevor Reed, Paul Whelan, and all prisoners unjustly imprisoned in the Russian Federation;

(5) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to provide unrestricted consular access to Trevor Reed while he remains in detention;

(6) until Trevor Reed's release, calls on the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) to provide Trevor Reed any necessary medical treatment and personal protective equipment;

(B) to notify the United States Ambassador to Russia of any medical problems or complaints that arise during his detention; and

(C) to provide the United States Embassy in Moscow with full access to all of Trevor Reed's medical records;

(7) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to respect Trevor Reed's universally recognized human rights; and

(8) expresses support to the family of Trevor Reed and commitment to bringing Trevor Reed home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 186.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 186, introduced by Mr. PFLUGER of Texas, calling for the release of Trevor Reed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan measure that we have now, regrettably, had to move through the committee and the House for two Congresses.

This is a good resolution that calls for the release of Trevor Reed and condemns the deplorable treatment inflicted upon him throughout his ordeal.

It is shameful that the Kremlin continues to make a mockery of the principles of an independent judiciary, the rule of law, and due process, holding innocent American hostages for nefarious political purposes. Not even the judge on Trevor Reed's case could keep a straight face when presented with the absurd case that the Russian prosecutors brought to the table, yet the courts sentenced him to 9 years in prison anyway.

On top of the unimaginable suffering Trevor has already endured as a result of his terrible conditions and refusal of the Russian authorities to attend to his medical needs, Mr. Reed has been now diagnosed with COVID-19.